

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added or cancelled.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 14-16 and 22-24 are currently being amended.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,585,154 to Ostrover et al. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, among other things:

wherein said at least one memory comprises an electrical circuit without an integral power source that is capable of being powered wirelessly so that the electrical circuit can transmit information wirelessly, wherein a first portion of the information for display to a user is stored in the printed document and a second portion of the information for display to the user is stored in said at least one memory, and wherein the printed document contains a printed indication to the user of the presence of the at least one memory storing the second portion of the information.

Turning now to the cited art of record, Ostrover et al. describes a system and method for documents with electronic copies attached thereto, whereby a microchip memory is affixed to a document. Column 4 of Ostrover et al. describes that the microchip may be an RF transponder chip. Also, column 4 of Ostrover et al. describes that the electronic copy may contain digital data or analog data; for example, an image, sound or texture.

Ostrover et al. does not disclose or suggest that his printed document contains a printed indication to the user of the presence of the at least one memory storing the second portion of the information, as recited in presently pending independent claim 1. Rather, the user in the system and method of Ostrover et al. must either know in advance that a document has a microchip on it, or the user must see the microchip affixed to the printed document.

In its rejection of dependent claim 22, whereby the features of that claim, along with other features, have been incorporated into presently pending independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Ostrover et al. describes that the “document 42 may be printed with a physical indication of the memory circuit (i.e. positions associated with the printing of the first information in the printed document and the chips can be affixed (affixation 68) before or after writing the second information) (see Figure 1, col. 5, lines 45-50, col. 6, lines 15-45). Applicants respectfully disagree. Namely, column 5, lines 45-50 of Ostrover et al. merely states that a printer translates electronic data into print data, and column 6, lines 15-45 of Ostrover et al. merely states that chips are stored with data and then affixed to a document. There is nothing in these portions of Ostrover et al. that disclose or suggest that a printed indication is provided on the affixed document to indicate that the document contains a chip. Similarly, Figure 1 of Ostrover et al. merely shows a set of affixing a chip to a surface of a document, whereby there is nothing in Figure 1 of Ostrover et al. that discloses or suggests that a printed indication is provided on the affixed document to indicate that the document contains a chip.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1, as well as the other presently pending independent claims that have been amended in a manner similar to the amendments made to claim 1, are not anticipated by Ostrover et al.

The presently pending dependent claims under rejection are patentable due to the specific features recited in those claims, as well as due to their respective dependence on one of the presently pending independent claims discussed above.

For instance, claim 4 recites that said information for combination with user provided information comprises code for execution by a processor of a reading device. The Office Action incorrectly asserts that column 6, lines 25-40 and Figures 1 and 2 of Ostrover et al. disclose or suggest these features. Rather, column 6, lines 25-40 of Ostrover et al. merely describes that a computer 44 may be used to read the electronic data, and it does not disclose

or suggest that the electronic data read by the computer 44 is code that is subsequently executed by the computer along with user provided information.

Accordingly, dependent claim 4 is patentable for these additional reasons.

Furthermore, dependent claim 3 recites that the second portion of the information stored in the at least one memory for display to the user comprises information for combination with user provided information to provide further information for display to the user. In its rejection of claim 3, the Office Action asserts that Figures 1 and 2 and column 6, lines 25-40 of Ostrover et al. discloses or suggests such features. Applicants respectfully disagree. Namely, the combining of information stored in a memory with user provided information, in order to provide further information for display to a user, is not disclosed or suggested by Ostrover et al. Rather, column 6, lines 25-40 of Ostrover et al. merely describes that data capture to store data in a chip to be affixed to a document, whereby there is no disclosure or suggestion in this portion of Ostrover et al. for combining that stored information with user provided information in order to provide further information for display to a user.

Accordingly, dependent claim 3 is patentable for these additional reasons.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 2, 2007

By Phillip J. Articola

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer No.: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819